UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,362	02/14/2002	Alexander Druyan	AUS920011019US1	1508

30449   7590   11/23/2010
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE
SUITE 302
LATHAM, NY 12110

EXAMINER
SWARTZ, STEPHEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 September 2010</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9,10 and 29-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9,10 and 29-45</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Final Office Action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed on 27 September

2010. Applicants amendment on 27 September 2010 amended Claims 30 and 38. Claim 1-3, 9,

10, 29, 31-37, and 39-45 are previously presented. Currently Claims 1-3, 9, 10 and 29-45 are

pending and have been examined. Claims 4-8, and 11-28 have been. The examiner notes that

the objections to the claims have been withdrawn based on the amendment of claims 30, and 38.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 27 September 2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

3.   The applicant argues on page 13 that Kinser does not disclose "that the WFA/DO is even

aware of the service inquiry before receiving the service tickets from the service ticketing system

of the SA".

         The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In the previously sited area of Kinser col. 55, lines (46-61) Kinser teaches that the WFA/DO is a

relied upon for dispatch of the trouble tickets (i.e. service requests) to the different technicians.

Kinser is not relied upon for the receiving of the service tickets Toyouchi is used (col. 11, lines

(25-45), col. 38, line (54)-col. 39, line (17), col. 42, lines (4-6) and lines (55-67), and the

combination of these two references teaches the limitation of first receiving and then sending the

trouble tickets (i.e. service requests) to the technicians. In summary, the claimed limitation that

Kinser specifically addresses is that after something that is received by Toyouchi the requests are

handled and distributed.

4.   The applicant argues on page 14 that Kinser does not disclose "that the request for the

service tickets (allegedly by the WFA/DO) is in response to a service inquiry request for a list of

services assigned to the technician".

        The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner points out that a combination of references are used to

address the claim limitations. Specifically Kinser is not relied on upon for requesting and

gathering the service requests of Toyouchi, but rather to take the combined service requests and

distributing the work to the various technicians. Toyouchi can be seen as a front of house system

used to gather the requests and place them where the combined reference Kinser takes the

requests and does the distribution of work to the technicians.

5.   The applicant argues on page 14 that Kinser discloses "a technician cannot be a

technician to whom the trouble tickets are assigned", "but rather is the technician from whom the

service inquiry is received before the service tickets are even generated" and that "claims 1 and

35 pertains to one and only one technician".

        The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner points out that the claim language does not say that

the technicians have to be the same individual, nor does it state that there is in fact only one

technician. Additionally while Toyouchi states a technician pulls the information together and then Kinser takes this information and distributes it to technicians there is no indication that the technician of Toyouchi who inputs the information could not then assign himself/herself one of some the trouble tickets (i.e. service requests) making it only one individual as alleged by the applicant.

6.   The applicant argues on page 15 that Kinser does not teach or disclose "said processor merging the received service tickets into a response list of tickets".

        The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments for further clarification (see; col. 55, lines (46-61) of Kinser which teaches a correlation process of the trouble tickets (i.e. service tickets) that are grouped together (i.e. merging) and sends the trouble ticket groups to the WFA/DO for dispatch. This process requires a processor (col. 41, lines (49-53). These trouble tickets are open requests for work and contain the list of all required actions.

7.   The applicant argues on page 15 that Kinser does not teach or disclose "said processor sorting the tickets in the response list by sort parameters to generate multiple sorted ticket request lists".

        The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments for further clarification (see; col. 55, lines (46-61) of Kinser which teaches a correlation process of the trouble tickets (i.e. service tickets) that are grouped together (i.e. merging) and sends the trouble ticket groups to the WFA/DO for dispatch. This process

requires a processor (col. 41, lines (49-53). These trouble tickets are open requests for work and

contain the list of all required actions. Additionally, there is a sorting process that takes place

based on priority, which will impact the amount of groups formed (see; col. 55, lines (54-55) of

Kinser).

8.   The applicant argues on page 18 that Kinser does not teach or disclose "anything about

a sorted ticket request list and therefore do not disclose storing the multiple sorted ticket request

lists in a cache memory, wherein the multiple sorted ticket request lists are concurrently stored in

the cache memory".

        The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments as noted above for further clarification (see; col. 55, lines (46-61) of

Kinser) which teaches a correlation process of the trouble tickets (i.e. service tickets) that are

grouped together (i.e. merging) and sends the trouble ticket groups to the WFA/DO for dispatch.

These trouble tickets are open requests for work and contain the list of all required actions.

Additionally, there is a sorting process that takes place based on priority, which will impact the

amount of groups formed (see; col. 55, lines (54-55) of Kinser).

        Furthermore for further clarification can be found in col. 55, lines (41-45) which

discloses a memory as part of the processing that is used for the batch processing of trouble

tickets (i.e. service tickets) in the above mentioned correlation.

9.   The applicant argues on page 20 states that it is not obvious that "a technician at a

browser who triggers the preceding complex process in which the same technician ends up

receiving the ticket to do work that the technician knew about at the very beginning".

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to the arguments the examiner points out that the claim language does not say that

the technicians have to be the same individual, nor does it state that there is in fact only one

technician. Additionally while Toyouchi states a technician pulls the information together and

then Kinser takes this information and distributes it to technicians there is no indication that the

technician of Toyouchi who inputs the information could not then assign himself/herself one of

some the trouble tickets (i.e. service requests) making it only one individual as alleged by the

applicant. Furthermore it is old and well known in the art that in many fields that tasks are

recorded and scheduled even in a one person shop because the amount of work is so large it is

difficult to remember every detail and recording it and scheduling the tasks for future application

is necessary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1-3, 34-37, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kinser, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,687,212) (hereafter Kinser) in view of Toyouchi et al. (U.S.

Patent 6,847,988 B2) (hereafter Toyouchi).

        Referring to Claim 1, Kinser teaches a method for displaying a list of service requests

from multiple service request systems on a single display, comprising:

   - in response to said receiving the service inquiry, said processor formulating and sending a
     service request status message to a plurality of service ticketing systems (see; col. 55,
     lines (46-61) of Kinser teaches batch processing (i.e. formulating) and submitting the
     open service requests to a system for dispatch to multiple systems.

   - said service request status message requesting service tickets specifying the services
     assigned to the technician from the service manager (see; col. 55, lines (58-61) of Kinser
     teaches assigning trouble tickets assigned to specific technicians).

   - after said sending the service request status message, said processor receiving the service
     tickets from the service ticketing systems, each service ticket specifying a different
     service of the services assigned to the technician (see; col. 55, line (56-61) of Kinser
     teaches the garages receiving the service tickets for the specific technicians and the
     details of the work).

   - said processor merging the received service tickets into a response list of tickets (see; col.
     55, lines (56-61) of Kinser teaches the list of services for the techinicans are compiles on
     dispatch reports (i.e. list of tickets)).

- said processor sorting the tickets in the response list by sort parameters to generate multiple sorted ticket request lists (see; col. 28, lines (16-18), col. 50, line (65) - col. 51, line (14), col. 55, lines (57-61) of Kinser teaches the capability of sorting service based on the priority of the service request and creating multiple tickets to different technicians based on what is needed to be completed an when and all this will show up on the dispatch report (i.e. list).

- displaying said processor storing the multiple sorted ticket request lists in a cache memory at the gateway manager for subsequent display to the technician of a sorted ticket request list of the multiple sorted ticket request lists, wherein the multiple sorted ticket request lists are concurrently stored in the cache memory (see; col. 43, lines (60-64), col. 47, lines (28-37), col. 55, lines (52-61), and col. 57, lines (19-26) of Kinser teaches a processor that stores multiple trouble tickets and the dispatch report (i.e. request lists) in memory that can be viewed in a display and additionally uses a gateway to distribute the trouble tickets to the technicians).

Kinser does not explicitly disclose the following limitation, however,

Toyouchi a computer processor receiving a service inquiry from a browser to which a technician is interfaced at a computer Comprising the browser, said computer processor being comprised by a gateway manager, said service inquiry requesting a list of services assigned to the technician for being performed by the technician (see; col. 11, lines 25-45), col. 38, line (54) – col. 39, line (17), col. 42, lines (4-6, and lines (55-67) of Toyouchi teaches a computer processor being used with a browser to manage service requests in the form of a plurality of requests (i.e. services) through a gateway stored in a table (i.e. list)).

Both Kinser and Toyouchi teach the handling of service requests in the business environment, therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Kinser to include a computer processor receiving a service inquiry from a browser to which a technician is interfaced at a computer Comprising the

browser, said computer processor being comprised by a gateway manager, said service inquiry requesting a list of services assigned to the technician for being performed by the technician as taught by Toyouchi, because in order to handle service requests by as many means as possible adding a browser to inquire and manage technicians will increase the method to include new ways of monitoring tasks thereby making the handling of service more robust.

Referring to Claim 2, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach the method of claim 1, Kinser further disclose the following limitation.

- before said sending the service request status message, said processor converting the service status request message to a format that is specific for each service ticketing system (see; col. 46, lines (1-19), and col. 58, lines (48-50) of Kinser teaches the service requests are grouped together in proactive and reactive along with a common service order processor that ensures the format is translated properly).

Referring to Claim 3, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach the method of claim 1, Kinser further disclose the following limitation.

- said processor converting the received service tickets into a common format wherein said merging results in the response list being in the common format (see; col. 55, lines (52-61), col. 58, lines (48-50), and col. 63, line (61) - col. 64, line (2) of Kinser teaches a common service order processor that translates the service information into a common format and this information is then dispatched to the different technicians so that the dispatch report is up to date and correct for each service requirement).

Referring to Claim 34, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach the method of claim 1, Kinser in further disclose the following limitation.

- displaying to the technician the sorted ticket request list by displaying sequential segments of tickets in the sorted ticket request list (see; col. 28, lines (16-18), col. 50, line (65) - col. 51, line (14) col. 55, lines (58-61) of Kinser teaches displaying a report with the service that needs to be performed listed based on how they were prioritized (i.e. sorted segments) before being sent).

Kinser does not explicitly disclose that it is displayed one segment at a time, but it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that specifying displaying one segment at a time would be considered a design choice as limiting which is shown in a list first does not patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art in providing a list of all the work a person needs to be completed which is already sorted for priority.

Referring to Claim 35, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach a computer program product. Claim 35 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 1. Claim 35 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 1

Referring to Claim 36, see discussion of claim 35 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi teaches the method above, Claim 36 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 2, Claim 36 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 2.

Referring to Claim 37, see discussion of claim 35 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi teaches the method above, Claim 37 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 3, Claim 37 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 3.

Referring to Claim 45, see discussion of claim 35 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi teaches the method above, Claim 45 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 34, Claim 45 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 34.

12.   Claims 9, 10, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinser, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,687,212) (hereafter Kinser) in view of Toyouchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,847,988 B2) (hereafter Toyouchi), in further view of Bergeron et al. (U.S. Patent 4,922,514) (hereafter Bergeron).

Referring to Claim 9, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach the method of claim 1, Kinser further disclose the following limitation.

- said processor resetting the sorted ticket lists in the cache after a predetermined time period (see; col. 29, lines (39-43), col. 47, lines (28-37), and col. 55, lines (52-61) of Kinser teaches a processor and memory that takes the sorted data and tries to maximize the efficiency of the work being completed therefore the dispatch report is sent to the technician with current open items to complete).

Kinser does not explicitly disclose that a time period expires, but the examiner takes official notice that in the service industry certain jobs are given a certain amount of time to complete based on the cost of the job. This would mean that when job is started it should be finished in a predetermined period of time. If an employee is especially poor at meeting the deadlines of jobs they will be replaced with someone who can meet the dead lines.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Kinser and Toyouchi to include a expiration of time because it will force specific jobs to be completed as efficiently as possible and the new lists will include this data making the scheduling of service more efficient.

Kinser and Toyouchi do not explicitly disclose the following limitation, however.

Bergeron teaches said processor determining an elapsed time since a last inquiry by a the technician (see; col. 4, lines (1-20) of Bergeron teaches a processor that keeps track of service engineers (i.e. technician) based on a event or time driven schedule and how it is accessed with an input/output device (i.e. inquiry)).

Kinser, Toyouchi and Bergeron teach maintaining service scheduling in a business environment and it would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Kinser and Toyouchi to include determining the elapsed time since a technician made an inquiry because in order to make sure an employee is completing tasks in the most efficient manner possible it is necessary to track their progress. With the tracking of progress the jobs will be better tracked making the process of service more robust.

Referring to Claim 10, Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Baergeron teach the method of claim 9, Kinser further disclose the following limitation.

- wherein said resetting comprises retrieving additional tickets for the ticketing systems (see; col. 21, par. (35-42), and col. 55, lines (56-61) of Kinser teaches a re-prioritizing of the group of service requests and then distributing them to the correct technician).

Referring to Claim 38, see discussion of claim 35 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi teaches the method above, Claim 38 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 9, Claim 38 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 9.

Referring to Claim 39, see discussion of claim 38 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Bergeron teaches the method above, Claim 39 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 10, Claim 39 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 10.

13.   Claims 29, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinser, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,687,212) (hereafter Kinser) in view of Toyouchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,847,988 B2) (hereafter Toyouchi), in further view of Northcutt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0126001 A1) (hereafter Northcutt).

Referring to Claim 29, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach the method of claim 1, Kinser in view of Toyouchi do not explicitly the following limitation, however,

Northcutt teaches using XML format (see; pg. 4, par. [0052] of Northcutt teaches representing the request for work (i.e. ticket) in an XML format).

Both Kinser, Toyouchi, and Northcutt teach the handling of work requests in the business environment and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Kinser and Toyouchi to include XML format as taught by Northcutt, because having a standard format that is easily viewable by all computers and readily shareable on the internet will increase the ability to distribute the information making the program more effective.

Referring to Claim 40, see discussion of claim 39 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Bergeron teaches the method above, Claim 40 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 29, Claim 40 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 29.

14.   Claims 30 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinser, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,687,212) (hereafter Kinser) in view of Toyouchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,847,988 B2) (hereafter Toyouchi), in further view of Northcutt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0126001 A1) (hereafter Northcutt).

Referring to Claim 30, Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Northcutt teach the method of claim 29, Kinser further disclose the following limitation.

- sort parameter to index a sort order of the tickets in the response list for each sort parameter (see; col. 28, lines (16-18), col. 50, line (65) – col. 51, line (14), col. 47, lines

(42-56), col. 55 (52-61) of Kiner teaches that there are parameters that can be sorted and prioritized, this information can then be used to create the dispatch report of tickets for the technicians.

Kinser, Toyouchi and Northcutt do not explicitly disclose the following limitations however,

Smith teaches creating a different integer array of pointers (see; col. 400, lines (33-35) of Smith teaches an integer array and it's combination with pointers), and

wherein each pointer in each integer array points to an item (see; col. 6, lines (19-29) and col. 400, lines (33-35) of Smith teaches that pointers are used to point to items, and that pointer are part of the integer array), and

rearranging the pointers in each integer array as the tickets are rearranged in the response list for each sort parameter (see; col. 6, lines 10-14), and col. 237, lines (10-14) of Smith teaches an integer array used in sorting parameters).

Kinser, Toyouchi, Northcutt and Smith deal with the handling of data in a business environment and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the method of Kinser, Toyouchi, and Northcutt to include creating a different integer array of pointers, each pointer in each integer array points to an item, and rearranging the pointers in each integer array as the tickets are rearranged in the response list for each sort parameter as taught by Smith because the added method of sorting will allow the data to be more thoroughly sorted to find the best solution to the service assignment making the program more effective.

Referring to Claim 41, see discussion of claim 37 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Northcutt teaches the method above, Claim 41 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 30, Claim 41 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 30.

15.   Claims 31, 32, 33, 42, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kinser, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,687,212) (hereafter Kinser) in view of

Toyouchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,847,988 B2) (hereafter Toyouchi), in further view of Smith et al.

(U.S. Patent 7,013,469 B2).

        Referring to Claim 31, Kinser in view of Toyouchi teach the method of claim 1, Kinser

in view of Toyouchi do not explicitly disclose the following limitations, however

Smith teaches wherein the sort parameters consist of a first sort parameter and a second sort

parameter (see; col. 737, lines (9-11) of Smith teaches two sort parameters), and

        wherein the multiple sorted ticket request lists consist of a first sorted ticket request list

and a second sorted ticket request list (see; col. 75, lines (29-35) and col. 737, lines (9-11) the

sorting of multiple of data including the ability to sort two parameters), and

        wherein said sorting comprises generating the first sorted ticket request list whose tickets

are sorted according to the first sort parameter and generating the second sorted ticket request list

whose tickets are sorted according to the second sort parameter (see; col. 75, lines (29-35) and

col. 737, lines (9-11) the sorting of multiple of data including the ability to sort two parameters

based on how the array is set up making for a multitude of search parameter combinations (i.e.

first sort generating second sort)).

        Kinser, Toyouchi, and Smith deal with the handling and sorting of data in a business

environment and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to expand the method of Kinser and Toyouchi to include the multiple sorted ticket

request lists consist of a first sorted ticket request list and a second sorted ticket request list, and

sorting comprises generating the first sorted ticket request list whose tickets are sorted according

to the first sort parameter and generating the second sorted ticket request list whose tickets are

sorted according to the second sort parameter as taught by Smith because the added method of

sorting will allow the data to be more thoroughly sorted to find the best solution to the service

assignment making the program more effective.

Referring to Claim 32, Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Smith teach the

method of claim 31, Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Smith do not explicitly

disclose the following limitations, however

Smith teaches wherein the first sort parameter, and wherein the second sort parameter

(see; col. 737, lines (9-11) of Smith teaches two sort parameters), however Smith does not

explicitly disclose that the first sort parameter consists of ticket request location and the second

sort parameter consists of type of service requested, The difference between the reference

(Smith, sorting method using parameters) and claim 32 (sorting using specific defined

parameters) relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to perform tracking a sorting

method). A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural

difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the

claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the

intended use, then it meets the claim.

Furthermore it should be noted that the use of "date" and "severity" is merely a non-

functional data labels. The use of this data label does not make this claim patentably

distinguishable over the prior art. It merely identifies specific terms for actions performed in

sorting information as taught by Smith.

Kinser, Toyouchi, and Smith deal with the handling and sorting of data in a business

environment and therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to expand the method of Kinser and Toyouchi to include the first sort parameter,

and wherein the second sort parameter as taught by Smith because the added method of sorting

will allow the data to be more thoroughly sorted to find the best solution to the service

assignment making the program more effective.

Referring to Claim 33, Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Smith teach the method of claim 31, Kinser in further disclose the following limitation.

- wherein the first sort parameter consists of ticket submission date, and wherein the second sort parameter consists of severity of problem to which service is directed (see; col. 45, line (19, and col. 49, line (5-8) of Kiner teaches that two possible parameters that can be used for sorting are date and severity of the problem).

Referring to Claim 42, see discussion of claim 35 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi teaches the method above, Claim 42 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 31, Claim 42 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 31.

Referring to Claim 43, see discussion of claim 42 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Smith teaches the method above, Claim 43 recites the same or similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 32, Claim 43 is therefore rejected for the same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 32.

Referring to Claim 44, see discussion of claim 42 above, while Kinser in view of Toyouchi in further view of Smith teaches the method above, Claim 44 recites the same or

similar limitations as those addressed above in claim 33, Claim 44 is therefore rejected for the

same or similar limitations as set forth above in claim 33.

Conclusion

16.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon considered pertinent to Applicant's

disclosure.

      a.   McPartian et al. (U.S. Patent 6,850,613 B2) discloses a customer service request

allocations based upon real-time data and forecast data.

      b.   Swartz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,813,278 B1) discloses a process for submitting and

handling service request in a local service management system.

c.   Sortch et al. (U.S. Patent 5,920,846) discloses a method and system for processing

a service request relating to installation, maintenance or repair of telecommunications

services provided to a customer premises.

d.   Vitale et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0254757 A1) discloses a

communication system work order performance method and system.

e.   Carr et al. (U.S. Patent 5,751,802) discloses a telecommunications service

provisioning.

f.   Ginter et al. (U.S. Patent 5,892,900) discloses a system and methods for secure

transaction management and electronic rights protection.

g.   Castonguay et al. (U.S. Patent 5,911,134) discloses a method for planning,

scheduling, and managing personnel.

h.   Barry et al. (U.S. Patent 6,615,258) discloses an integrated customer interface for

web based data management.

i.   Vitale et al. (U.S. Patent 7,111,318 B2) discloses a communications system work

order performance method and system.

j.   Hollinger et al. (U.S. Patent 7,472,181 B2) discloses an automated real-time

appointment control by continuously updating resources for possible rescheduling of

existing appointments.

k.   Druyan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0154118 A1) discloses a method and

system for managing service requests across multiple systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to STEPHEN SWARTZ whose telephone number is (571) 270-

7789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SSS
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Jonathan G. Sterrett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623